

Is the Sabbath
Binding upon the
Christian Conscience?

BY

JOHN HALDANE.

TORONTO.

TO BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.

289773

IS THE SABBATH BINDING UPON THE
CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE?

BY

JOHN HALDANE.

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year eighteen hundred
and ninety-six, by John Haldane, at the Department of Agriculture.

TORONTO.

TO BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.



INTRODUCTION.

Conversing, some months ago, with some of my associates, professional men, on the proposed plebiscite in reference to the Street Cars, I found a great diversity of opinion, arising from undefined ideas of the relation of the Christian to the Jewish Dispensation, as well as upon a supposed abrogation of the Sabbath day by St. Paul. I differed from them, but with such an appearance of right on my side, that I was courteously asked to explain my views in writing for publication. I wrote them at the time, but the publication has been delayed by other engagements. Consulting lately, however, with some others, I found they were not in sympathy with me—chiefly on the score of the greater enlightenment of our progressive age which in the Arts and Sciences has contributed so much to the comforts of life.

The houses of our forefathers are, they say, no longer fit habitations. They must be remodeled, according to modern notions, or deserted for new, palatial dwellings. Our religion, in its present form, might have suited the comparatively ignorant people of a former age, but it is unsuited to the more cultivated people of the Nineteenth Century. Its very phraseology is obsolete and distasteful; and its doctrines, freed from much of their severities, must be delivered in more refined language to be acceptable at the present day—such is their opinion.

I feel that what I have written on the subject, "Is the Sabbath binding on the Christian Conscience"? would be incomplete without reference to them, but, as the argument is somewhat different, I thought it would be clearer to give it in the independent form of an Introduction. The argument in the first case is chiefly, "Are we bound by Jewish laws? and did St. Paul ever abrogate the Sabbath"? Here it is—"Is our Religion, as the Arts and Sciences, capable of enlargement, and are we warranted in altering, or in any way modifying its requirements"?

In the first place I contend that true Religion needs not the help of science, but that it, as originally intended, must be intelligible by the meanest capacity to justify responsibility and a future

judgment, and that its property, truth, renders it incapable of improvement and therefore unalterable.

Again I believe that a poor woman, unable to read, but who, listening, has imbibed instruction, and, under spiritual influences, is living the Christian life, experiencing its softening influences on all her ills, with an assurance of a bright Hereafter, desires no change in her Religion.

Astronomy can look back upon the errors of preceding ages, and she may boast that she can now, from her elevated platform, view with mathematical certainty the magnitudes, distances and movements of the Heavenly Bodies.

But our Religion is a remedial system, with a history, for the benefit of all mankind from creation, based on Eternal Truths, necessary to carry out its benevolent purpose, enunciated partly by the Creator Himself, partly through specially appointed ministers, consecrated to His service, and embodied in One Book, the Bible.

Unlike Astronomy, emerging from error into a reliable science, by the co-operation of true philosophers, the Bible has been assailed by a relentless opposition to its truth. In the first case the effort has been from error to truth—in the latter case from truth to error.

Nevertheless by a miraculous interposition of Providence the Bible has been preserved entire, and its foundation stone, the Pentateuch, is the same this day as it was, when penned by Moses over 3300 years ago.

We see error in the origin of the Arts and Sciences, but the nearer we can reach the source of our religion, as given in our Bible, the more confidence we have in its truthful purity.

To suppose, by implication even, through honest error, that St. Paul would assume the right of abrogating any part of the Decalogue, is incredible; but to suppose that any man by himself would dare to change or modify, by any coloring of his own reason, any commandment of God, is more so.

St. Paul wrote to his converts in Corinth, 1 Cor. 2: 13, 14, in relation to their sophists, who opposed him, "which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

To a question, "Master, which is the great commandment in the Law?" Christ answered, by giving a summary of the Decalogue.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and

with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment."

"And the second is like unto it."

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

It is the business and duty of the clergy to maintain in its integrity the Decalogue, as thus interpreted by the Founder of our religion, and their zealous efforts, beyond enforcing its first requirement, our duty and responsibility to God, will materially aid the Legislature, with its machinery of law, to maintain peace and to secure protection to the person and property in all our domestic, social and political relations.

Self-constituted educators there are who consider the former Theology as effete, and who propose a new Theology, more human, and in more accord with the "advanced thought" of a progressive age.

We find accordingly that the Decalogue, arrogantly wrested from its "moorings" in Scripture, has been rudely assailed by a human philosophy in little sympathy with the Christian Church, which in all its various branches recognizes its divine authority.

Indeed the Church of England gives it special prominence in her form of worship. It precedes the Communion Service with a solemn prayer for divine aid to prepare the heart for its due reception. The priest then solemnly proclaims each commandment, to which the congregation prayerfully respond, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law."

It is engraven, with letters of gold, in marble tablets, built in the walls of many places of public worship, inspiring in solemn silence, its authoritative claim to our obedience as the *Standard Moral Law*, written by the finger of God, primarily for governing the conduct of His creatures to Himself—secondarily for affording a model for framing all laws, municipal or national, for governing society.

The late celebrated Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, England, is a popular exponent of the so-called "advanced thought." He considers the Decalogue abrogated. But, referring to its fourth Commandment he thinks that it is desirable to set apart certain days for special worship, on the ground of wise and Christian expediency alone, not on that of divine statute or command, but on the authority of the Church. "Accordingly," he says, "in early, we cannot say exactly how early times, the Church of Christ felt the necessity of substituting something, in place of the ordinances

which had been repealed ; and the Lord's day arose, not a day of compulsory rest, not such a day at all as modern Sabbatarians suppose ; not a Jewish day ; rather a day in many respects absolutely contrasted with the Jewish Sabbath."

Now, we learn from Scripture that the disciples met for devotion on the evening of the Resurrection day, and again after eight days, John 20: 19-26, with the countenance of Jesus on both occasions, and continuously thereafter on the first day of the week, Acts 20: 7.

Except the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, Christians generally, under their peculiar circumstances, kept both the seventh and first days of the week.

About A.D. 363, the Council of Laodicea, by their 29 Canon, "forbade Christians to rest on the Sabbath day, that is to say, the seventh day, but preferring the Lord's day to rest, if indeed it should be in their power as Christians"

This Council did not abrogate the Decalogue Sabbath. They decreed an observance of it more consistent with its elevation to a higher plane in the progressive system of the Remedial Covenant.

The Jewish National Sabbath, inspired originally from the Decalogue, became so perverted by human traditions—clogged with senseless burdens—rendered uncongenial by needless restraints, and changed from a spiritual means of religion to a meritorious formalism that Christ condemned it.

Again, a typical form of worship was incongruous with an anti-typical form of worship. A sacrificial service was not in tone with a "breaking of bread" service. The one was offered in faith of a promise to be fulfilled ; the other was offered with very significant symbols, denoting not only the fulfilment of the promise, but its resultant effects of spiritual strength imparted, and consequent grateful joy.

The first day of the week service was thus ordained to be considered the Christian Sabbath.

The Decalogue Sabbath places God in the foreground, demanding, as His right, our fealty to Him, as our Creator, but by a service producing and maintaining, by a reactionary influence, a spiritual character through communion with our Heavenly Father by a golden bond of nature—a fitting ordinance by a benevolent Creator—affording the privileged means of assimilation to Himself.

A creature of body and soul, through their mutual relations by rest and communion with his Maker, reaches a perfect manhood, enabling him to grace the present life and qualifying him for his glorious Hereafter.

But the human Sabbath, by wresting from its proper original application Christ's remark, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," places man in the foreground, and recommends it to be employed chiefly in recreation from the toils of life, the invigorating of his body by healthful engagements, and in examining works of art, &c., &c., for the improvement of his mind.

A spiritual nature is expected to become developed by an evolution process, contrary to our Christian faith.

Arts and Sciences, as hand-maidens of Christianity, are useful and refining ; and it would be well if philanthropy would secure a half holiday in the middle of the week for their cultivation. But, as ruling powers, they tend to degeneracy, as exemplified by the profligacy and sensuality of Corinth, styled by Cicero '*totius Graeciae lumen*' (the light of all Greece), from the task of Christianizing whose inhabitants St. Paul shrank dismayed till encouraged by his Master in a vision. Acts 18: 9, 10.

In Corinth, as with us, the most bitter opponent to simple Christian doctrine was human philosophy, the poisoner of spiritual life.

The Rev. Mr. Robertson writes on the occasion of the movement in England to open the Museums and places of Art on Sundays. He says that though convinced this movement will tend to humanize, he is not convinced that it will tend to Christianize, but rather the contrary, quoting the experience of Greece. But nevertheless he would not sign a Petition to the Legislature against it,

1st, because it would be a return to Judaism.

2nd, because forcing coercively the ultra rigour of Sabbath observance tends to aggregate evil.

3rd, because enforcing a positive law tends to weaken a moral law.

His mind seems perplexed in the mazes of human philosophy, unreliable for guidance.

Shipping for the "Harbour of Rest," we would have very little heart to cross a perilous ocean on a ship without chart, compass or rudder, but dependent upon our fellows, however respectable, claiming each to direct our course by his individual knowledge

Ephes. 6: 10, 11, 12. St. Paul courageously defines clearly the evils to be overcome. He writes "Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armour of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers—

against the rulers of the darkness of this world—against spiritual wickedness in high places.”

Rom. 8: 37. But again, “Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us.”

We would feel much more assured and safe by casting in our lot with him, an inspired apostle.

This same Rev. Mr. Robertson by human reasoning, rendered plausible by a devotional feeling of the Infinite Goodness of God, subtracts from the atonement doctrine its vital and meritorious element, the foundation of Christian hope. But this is outside the present enquiry. It loosens however our confidence in him as an expositor of truth.

The human Sabbath has no history unless it be in the line of the more gross opponents of Christianity, who, in its origin, falsely conceived that in its merciful provisions, it abrogated the seventh Commandment in consideration of the weakness of human nature—so denounced by the Apostles. The Decalogue Sabbath has a history. It was instituted at Creation, promulgated more definitely from Mount Sinai when embodied in the Decalogue, written by the hand of God Himself, on two tables of stone, and deposited in the Ark as an authoritative standard of moral law—more clearly interpreted by Christ, who revealed its spiritual meaning—and preached in its entirety by His inspired Apostles.

The successful efforts of Scientists in developing Nature in its different branches seems to have excited would-be scripture philosophers to signalize themselves by broaching new ideas congenial to the human mind because professing to disenthral man, by the broad views of an enlightened age, from the restraints of law.

They forget that, while the Scientist is bringing to light the hidden properties of matter, they are intermeddling with what has been revealed by the Great Creator, and that they are darkening the light by human error.

They would be acting more in the line of advanced thought by removing Pharisaical formalism and any admixture of human sophistry with divine revelation—while denouncing indifference or levity to Ordinances of God, originally instituted for the spiritual good of man.

The humorous, characteristic and instructive reply of a Scotch clergyman to his assistant is somewhat in point. To a question by the young man, whether with a view of modernizing the service, he might not be permitted to leave out the Lord's Prayer, he answered, “oo aye, gin ye can mak a better.”

Increasing knowledge is intoxicating, and some infatuated philosophers are beguiled to extend their researches into forbidden ground—the secret things of God.

Permitted to reach, through our senses, such a deep knowledge of His awful greatness and His infinite wisdom, we should feel appalled from questioning His counsels.

Would any mortal entertain the foolhardy conceit that he could govern and direct our world, coursing its orbit at the rate of 67,000 miles an hour? Would he dare to offer suggestions to the Centre of Power and Wisdom?

True philosophy, shrinking from speech, listens with child-like simplicity—the character of those who alone, as the Founder of our religion declares, shall be permitted to enter the kingdom of heaven, Matthew 18: 3.

Some “enlarged minds,” regarding the railroad as much superior to the former mode of traveling, conceive the idea that the Christian course may, under the new enlightenment, be rendered more agreeable and easy by removing irksome and uncongenial restraints. This is a delusion. They know that the track for the railroad must, to ensure security from danger, be leveled, and all engineering difficulties overcome by dynamite, the pick and the shovel. Similarly the human mind must be leveled by eradicating its “engineering difficulties”—prejudice, selfishness, pride, wrath, &c., &c., &c., by such powers, outside of itself or of moral philosophy, as alone can effect the object. Again, they know that a car placed on the road would continue stationary till connected with the dynamo. Similarly they should remember that a human soul must be connected with its spiritual dynamo to enable it to act.

Any substitution of inferior means for leveling, or any interference with the motor power is not true philosophy—nay, it is tampering with the declared conditions and “prescription” of the Remedial Covenant.

A literary man—a skeptic, to ease his mind from galling uncertainty, resolved to seek relief by deep research. He determined, *tabulâ rasâ*, to examine Scripture for himself. He discovered a settled, pre-ordained scheme gradually rising before his mind, wisely devised to suit mankind at its initial stage, and advisedly unfolding itself in proportion to the demands of progressing time, and eminently suited to fulfil the purpose of the Benevolent Creator. He acknowledged the hand of God. He published the result of his researches for the benefit of his once co-skeptics, anonymously, in a small but valuable work styled, “Plan of Salvation.”

God is *One*. His pre ordained counsel for the restoration of a fallen world is *One*. The announcement, "I will put enmity between thee (the serpent) and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," contains within itself, as the seed of a plant, all the multifarious forces for its future organization, but like the plant it must be preserved from outside injury during its growth.

The structure discovered by the author of "Plan of Salvation" is unique, dependent during its development on the continuity of its parts to ensure the ultimate object of the Creator, as the plant is upon its root, stem, branches and leaves for the production of its fruit.

To admit of "chipping" and substituting human ideas to adapt it better to varied philosophies would be to convert its unique *One-ness* into a chaos, and ignominious defeat of its object.

Christ said to the cavilling Pharisees, "Search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me," a counsel very applicable to the would-be philosophers of the present day.

The Bible has a history, unassailable. It has been translated into more than 100 different languages, producing millions of copies. It claims a Divine protection against its virulent opponents and all human attempts at interpolations, or alterations in translations. It has been authoritatively subjected twice to the severest criticism of the most learned men of the day, and the award is *substantial one-ness* in all its diversified forms—the characteristic evidence of truth divine.

Advancing thought, in the hands of a man like Professor Hy. Drummond, materially aids in "brightening" Revelation. His work on "Natural law in the Spiritual World" is of value.

In the following remarks I have endeavoured to "locate" the Original Creation Sabbath in its authoritative position in the Decalogue, but before publishing my thoughts, I submitted my manuscript to two whom I deemed most qualified by position and individual character, for approval.

The Rev'd Wm. Caven, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Knox College. The Rev'd Jas. P. Sheraton, D.D., LL.D., Principal Wycliffe College.

Though unknown to them, they, most loyally to the cause, and courteously to myself, responded readily.

I subjoin their answers with the sole object, quite apart from any personal considerations, of securing, through their indorsement, the sympathy and confidence of my reader in a matter of such deep importance.

KNOX COLLEGE, TORONTO,
23 April, 1896.

DEAR MR. HALDANE,—

I have carefully read your Essay on the law of the Sabbath. I can have no hesitation in saying that it is written with much ability and judgment, and with clear insight not only into the question immediately under discussion, but into the meaning and the relations of the Old Testament Dispensation and the New.

The Essay in my opinion is altogether worthy to be put into circulation, and is fitted to promote the observance of the Lord's day. It would be read with pleasure and profit by all who are interested in the Scriptural Argument for the day of rest, and it could hardly fail to make an impression on any who would thoughtfully peruse it.

(Signed)

W. CAVEN.

And in answer to my asking if I might be permitted to use his Letter in whole or in part:—

MY DEAR MR. HALDANE,

5 May, 1896.

I shall very gladly have you use the words I wrote, in relation to your valuable Essay on the Sabbath day, in any way you may think proper.

(Signed)

W. CAVEN.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE, TORONTO,
June 19, 1896.

MY DEAR MR. HALDANE,—

I have read your paper with great interest and pleasure. It is written in a very clear and cogent style. I entirely agree with the position taken, and with the views set forth in regard to the relations of the Old to the New Dispensation. Thoughtful readers will appreciate it, &c., &c.

(Signed)

J. P. SHERATON.

And in answer to mine asking if I might use his letter:—

July 3, 1896.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I am quite willing that you should use my name in connection with what I wrote.

(Signed)

J. P. SHERATON.

Is the Sabbath Binding on the Christian Conscience ?

The proposed plebiscite in the matter of the Street Cars has evoked comments from many laymen from different standpoints. The argument had been restricted within the limit whether running them on Sunday was a violation of the Fourth Commandment. But from the public expression of a magnate of the Church of England, that the Sabbath is not binding on the Christian conscience, the area of controversy becomes enlarged, and the question now really is, "Is the Sabbath binding on the conscience?"

A correct answer to this latter question will determine in a great measure an answer to the former. For if the Sabbath, as originally instituted and embodied in the Decalogue is abrogated, and no longer binding on the conscience, the running of the street cars becomes a mere matter of municipal arrangement for the convenience of the inhabitants.

An honest layman, in his embarrassment, consults his Bible, as his only reliable guide

The subject is one of first importance, as it involves a duty to his Creator. As such, he regards in his investigation all human speculation as extraneous, yea, as impiously irreverent. Again, with the skeptic he has no sympathy. He is out of court in the enquiry. His Bible alone must be his final judge.

We read of its institution and consecration. "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," Gen. 2: 3.

With intense interest the Intelligences of Heaven watched the gradual development of this world from the womb of darkness. "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," Job 28: 7.

Adam must have regarded it, when completed, with wondrous admiration. How natural for him to bow down in worship, and to employ the first efforts of his mind in praising his Creator, by devoutly contemplating His works.

While the institution of the Sabbath involved a solemn duty, that of a creature to his Creator, it was productive of an essential

blessing to himself. Communion with God, by a reactionary influence, stimulates good affections, and maintains a disposition of gratitude and obedience.

To Adam, when alone, the proper observance of the Sabbath constituted his religion. It sufficed to enable him to discharge his duty to his Creator. Had he not fallen, it would have equally sufficed for his posterity; for the sincere love of God is the source of all religion.

In this initial stage of our investigation, its evident suitability to the most important purpose of life entitles it to very serious consideration.

It was instituted for Adam and his posterity. In anticipation of the possible suggestion of a common error, it may be remarked it would be very absurd to suppose that it was intended exclusively for a future branch, the Jews, in about 2,500 years thereafter.

Adam fell, under the covenant of works. Mercy intervenes, and we read of a gracious promise of restoration, under a covenant of grace, in the mysterious words, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent."

This was not intended to abrogate the covenant of works. It is remedial, and, as St. Paul declares, "It does not make it void, but it establishes it." Rom. 3: 31.

The Sabbath became more obligatory, by a new debt of gratitude for deliverance from the death sentence, and as a spiritual restorative. Again, through the prescience of a Benevolent Creator the Sabbath became available precious to His fallen creatures in meliorating his sentence, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground."

His mortal body now required occasional rest by a physical necessity; and his spirit can only find peace in communion with his offended but reconciled Creator.

The Covenant of Grace, involving our deepest interest, is the subject of the Bible—a system—its development the main feature of the world's history. To understand our individual interest in it aright, we must examine it carefully in its minutest details.

For about 2,500 years, the consecrated Sabbath—the institution of marriage, as declared by Christ, Matt. 19: 3-10, and the promise of restoration, constituted religion.

God appeared to Abraham about the year 2183. He selected him to represent the human race, not on account of merit, for he was an idolator, Joshua 24: 2, and with him, as *our Representative*, he entered into a subsidiary covenant, on condition of obedience, on his part, by which the Covenant of Grace, hitherto transmitted orally, became signed, sealed and delivered, with an indelible

signature, to be impressed by Abraham upon his own flesh, the rite of circumcision.

He was chosen as the honored one, through whom the promise in Eden was to be carried out. He was told, "In thy seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." Gen. 12: 1-3.

When the promise, as regards his natural seed, was given, his appointment, as the father of many nations, was peculiar. In the Septuagint it is translated, "tetheica," "I have constituted" thee, the father of many nations, inapplicable to a natural father. This appointment regulates the succession—and governs not only the heirs of his body but also mankind, of whom he was appointed the representative. The inheritance is spiritual—reconciliation with God and eternal life—the conditions faith and obedience—and entailed to such only as become conformed to him in spirit. St. Paul shews the distinction between the two seeds—that by the law of nature, and that by the faith of Abraham. Romans 4: 16, 17.

In due course of time, about 2493, Moses appears, under providential circumstances. He is charged with taking his brethren, the descendants of Abraham, from bondage in Egypt to take possession of the promised land. He wrote the first five Books of Scripture. In his history, beyond an evident allusion to the seventh day as recognized by Noah, in sending the dove from the Ark, no special occasion called forth any remarks about the Sabbath day till we come to the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, in which most explicit directions for its solemn observance were given to the Israelites, in the collection of the manna before reaching Mount Sinai, by a law evidently then in force.

Outside of Moses we have disinterested evidence that the Nations observed a traditionary Creation Sabbath. Hesiod says, "ebdomon ieron emar," "the seventh day is holy." Theophilus writes of it, as "the day which all men honor," Josephus says "no City of Greeks or Barbarians can be found which does not acknowledge the seventh day's rest from labor." And many others similarly. Rest to our bodies since the fall becomes a matter of physical necessity.

We now reach Mount Sinai in the history. Here is recorded the solemn scene of the promulgation of the Law by the Almighty Himself, amidst thunderings and lightnings.

He appears as the *Sovereign* of the *Universe*. He Himself promulgates the Moral Law, called the Decalogue. Ex. 20: 1-18.

The laws of the Decalogue have special characteristics, as the laws of the Creator, for the observance of each member of the human race.

They are concise, intelligible by all, on the standard principle, established by Christ, Matthew 5, in contradistinction to civil law,

with its many volumes, beyond the reach of the people, and puzzling to Jurists and Judges.

Each is addressed to every individual of mankind by the thoughtful word, "Thou."

Unlike civil laws, protected by punishments graded, according to demerit, with the exception of the fifth, each is merely a prohibition, infusing by its solemn silence, deep forebodings for transgression.

The fifth offers a reward beyond the power of man to bestow.

So sacred is the Decalogue that whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. James 2: 10.

A thought, leading to a breach of one law, renders a man amenable. Matthew 5: 28.

Such laws are beyond the cognizance of any human court of judicature. They can be administered by God alone.

After promulgation God wrote them with His own finger on two tables of stone. Exodus 30: 18.

When Moses, in his wrath, on seeing the worship of the golden calf, broke them, he was ordered to hew out two more stones, upon which God wrote them again. God then required him to deposit them in the Ark.

Looking thoughtfully into the Decalogue, and regarding its object of inculcating love to God and love to man, it appears as an amplification of the Creation Sabbath. If God, in the language of science, is our spiritual "Dynamo" from whom all spiritual life is derived, and if that life is communicated by communion with Him, would not an honest and sincere observance of the Sabbath build up a character for the faithful discharge of the duties required?

The details of the Decalogue, suitable to our condition here, will be unsuitable to our condition hereafter, where "they neither marry, nor are given in marriage"—and where our bodies, immortal, will not be susceptible of injury by others.

The religion of heaven is communion with God. This invests its type, the Sabbath, with a solemn import.

The first word of the Fourth Commandment, "Remember," strikes us as peculiar, evidently referring to an existing law of sacred obligation. Its connection is central, connecting and influencing our duty to man by our duty to God.

What interest have we in this solemn promulgation? Much misconception prevails.

We send representatives to Parliament to make our laws. We are bound by them, if even faulty through human frailty. Ignorance is no palliation for transgression.

Under the Covenant of Grace every procedure must be directed by the free will of God.

He selected Abraham, and He dealt with him and his descendants, as the *representatives* of mankind.

He summons them to an attendance on Him at Mount Sinai, where in person with fearful solemnities, He promulgates the Decalogue—the standard exponent of the Divine mind.

Comparing smaller things with greater, if we are bound by the laws of our Legislature, we are more solemnly bound by the laws of Mount Sinai.

Man had become so demoralized by the fall, that the promulgation of the Decalogue became essentially necessary in inaugurating the Israelites for carrying out His purpose.

The Decalogue was an object lesson for convincing man of his condemnation by law, and for exhibiting an exemplar of conduct under the provisions of the Covenant of Grace.

St. Paul, in writing to the Galatians, explains to them that the law was our school-master to bring us to Christ. Gal. 3: 24.

The Legislature alone can rescind or alter a law.

God alone can rescind or alter the Decalogue.

Were He to change one clause, we would expect it to be declared with similar solemnities with the original proclamation.

Advanced thought by progressive knowledge, is unlocking the arcana of nature and utilizing its mysterious agents to the purposes of life. Similarly by an increasing knowledge of the great Creator should the excellency of His character be maintained by a more scrupulous interpretation of the Decalogue.

Nations form their domestic policies by inspiration from the Decalogue—and indeed a celebrated Jurist affirms that any law contrary to it is not binding. Daniel was justified in refusing to obey the decree of Nebuchadnezzar.

Again, though the laws of one nation are not binding upon any one of another nation, the Decalogue is obligatory upon every individual of every nation, reaching to the thoughts and intents of his heart. A man may meditate murder, but he may be prevented from the act. He may thus escape civil law, but he is amenable to the law of God.

After the promulgation Moses wrote, at the dictation of God a code of laws to govern the Israelites, as a nation. It was of a duplex character, suited to the service to which they were appointed, and for regulating their relations to other nations and to themselves individually. It was a religio-political constitution under a theocracy, with Moses as prime minister.

The religious element was the chief feature, and was indeed the Christian religion in embryo, under significant types of sacrifices, washings, jubilee sabbaths, &c., terminable when their purpose was served; and then no longer obligatory.

The promise in Eden had become sealed under a subsidiary covenant with Abraham, as the representative of the human race. It was now formulated under significant types, as instructive object lessons, preparatory to the coming of the great Antitype Himself, "A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel."

In due time John the Baptist heralds the kingdom of Heaven, of which Moses and the prophets did write,

Christ, the Messias, is King.

It is remedial in character, spiritual in government, and universal in extent—a new and higher dispensation of the Covenant of Grace, under the subsidiary covenant with Abraham.

Christ forewarns the assembled multitudes, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." He unlocks the Decalogue, by explaining its true and spiritual meaning, in opposition to the interpretation of the Scribes, declaring that "unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven."

He taught them

I say unto you except a man be born again he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven. John 3 : 3.

God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. John 14 : 4.

I am the way, the truth and the life. John 14 : 6.

I am the resurrection and the life : he that believeth in Me though he were dead yet shall he live. John 11 : 25 ; and many other such lessons of the Covenant of grace.

He appointed Apostles to announce His Kingdom to the world, and to declare His terms of admission to it.

It was not antagonistic to the Jewish, but a more advanced dispensation of the one system. The time had arrived for the efflorescence of that Tree whose roots were planted in Eden, and whose trunk, branches and leaves had been developed under the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations.

St. Paul, a special apostle, is considered by some to have preached the abrogation of the Sabbath. The idea of this zealous servant lowering the Standard Law of God, in its most important feature, confutes itself as a thing incredible.

We must examine all circumstances in connection very carefully.

The unbelieving Jews considered the dispensation of Moses as perfect, and the only means of salvation.

They regarded the Christian Gospel as a detestable heresy.

Some converted Jews pressed the Gentiles to join their law

with the Gospel, believing that, by its sacrifices and purifications, the Gospel might become a complete form of Religion.

Some relied unwarrantably on the favoritism of God—and that none outside could be saved, unless by becoming Jews by circumcision.

Some considered Christians as profane for neglecting institutions which they considered sacred.

St. Paul was the Gentile Apostle.

His doctrine was *Justification by faith in Jesus Christ*, pure and simple, according to the teachings of his Master.

In the course of his Missions he had bitter contentions with those Judaizers, who followed him wherever he went, with a jealous malignity, to subvert his doctrine.

There was, moreover, the Standard Sabbath law of the Decalogue.

There was the Jewish Sabbath law, adopted by inspiration from it—so perverted in time that Christ denounced it—but for the formal observance of which they so hotly contended, that they threatened Christ with death as a breaker of it.

There was the Christian Sabbath adopted by the Apostles in commemoration of the Resurrection. The time was changed for regulating the religious services under the Mosaic dispensation, for we learn from Exodus 12 chap. that the 7th month Abib was made the first month in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt, and from which the Israelites were to determine thereafter their festivals. Circumstances justify a deviation from time, the main object being maintained, or rather advanced.

What was more natural when the disciples were assembled, in the evening of the Resurrection day, under all the most interesting circumstances prescribed by St. Luke, than that, in commemoration of it, they should have determined to celebrate it then, and weekly thereafter for the breaking of bread, as Christ had commanded them to do, Himself then present, and on the following first day of the week, countenancing them.

A Sabbath, commemorating the work of Redemption with the work of Creation, brought more glory to God.

The simultaneous keeping of the Sabbath by all is a geographical impossibility.

One skilled in interpreting law will notice the wording of the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath," or rest day. "Six

days shalt thou labour, but the seventh day, &c." No particular day to count from is given. The seventh portion of time would seem to be the measure of the law.

In his Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul defends his doctrine, "Justification by faith," against any works by fallen man being considered as meritorious in earning salvation. He explains fully in the 3rd chap., which should be carefully read throughout, and noted *verbatim*.

Anticipating a possible objection by an opponent, he abruptly, in the last verse, asks a question, "Do we then make void the law through faith?" and answers it with strong feeling, "God forbid: yea, we establish the law."

St. Paul was a man whose yea was yea, and whose nay was nay. And we must take this unambiguous declaration with us in judging of any future remarks in this, or his other letters.

A passage in the 14th chap., 5th verse, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike, &c.," is regarded by some as favoring the idea of the abrogation of the Sabbath. But a mere inference, in a matter of such deep importance, is not to be received against a plain declaration. Besides, as Dr. MacNight shews, the contention here is not about the Decalogue Sabbath, but as between the Jewish and Christian Sabbath.

Ignatius, a companion of the Apostles, says, "Let us no more sabbatize, but let us keep the Lord's day, in which our life arose."

In the 13th chap., 9th verse, he urges obedience to the second table of the Law, quoting the words. Is it conceivable that he would mutilate the first table?

In his letter to the Ephesians he writes: "Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances (*en dogmasi*) for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace, and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Eph. 2: 15.

The enmity of the Jews and Gentiles was mutual. Tacitus says "Moses appointed them new rites, contrary to those of all other mortals, and they account as profane every thing held sacred by us"

Christ, the antitype, abolished the ceremonial typical law, the dividing line, by suffering on the cross. By thus slaying the cause of enmity between the Jew and the Gentile, He made of twain one

new people, and by slaying the sinful passions of both, the cause of enmity to God, He made of the two one visible Church. Rom. 6: 6; Gal. 6: 14.

Note. The word ("dogmasi") "Ordinances" comes from a word which signifies "to seem good, or to be according to one's idea," as the decree of Augustus, or the ritual ordinances of Moses. It is not applicable to the Decalogue, founded on the eternal principles of nature and reason.

Nothing surely can be made of this as inferring an Abrogation of the Sabbath.

The next passage is in Colossians 2: 14. "Blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross."

St. Paul here argues against Judaizers who were maliciously trying to subvert his pure Gospel by Jewish doctrines.

In the former part of this letter he had written "in whom ye have redemption through His blood, even the *forgiveness* of *sins* For it pleased the Father that in *Him* should all *fullness* dwell." Col. 1: 14. Again, "Whom we preach, warning every man in all wisdom that we may present every man *perfect* in *Christ Jesus*, and ye are complete in Him." Col. 1: 19.

Here from the context insisting upon "forgiveness" and "complete in Christ" with the change of the pronoun from "ye" to "us" the "Ordinances" must include not only the ceremonial typical law, the dividing line between Jew and Gentile, of which he wrote to the Ephesians, but the Decalogue written by the finger of God, known as the "Chirograph," and obligatory upon all, Jew and Gentile alike. But this is in perfect accord with what St. Paul wrote to the Roman converts, that neither the law of Nature nor the laws of Moses could avail in procuring Justification and Sanctification, and when he says so emphatically in reference to the Gospel doctrine, "do we then make void the law through faith—God forbid, yea we establish the law." And, again, it is in perfect accord with what he wrote to the Galatians, "Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Christ came to fulfil the law. He came not to blot that out which St. Paul describes in his letter to the Romans as "holy and just and good," Rom. 7: 12, but its condemnation against us by acting our substitute, and thereby honoring it. He came in the tender-

ness of His love to square its demands against us. He came a Redeemer, He came not a Revolutionist.

The contention with the Judaizers in the case of the Colossians was not whether law was abrogated, but which law the Mosaic or the Christian was the authorized law for Justification and Sanctification, and St. Paul, with characteristic ardor, declares in upholding the Christian law that Christ blotted out the handwriting of Ordinances that was against us, &c. But here he could only refer in the case of the Decalogue to its judicial character for condemnation or approval, which was abolished by the merciful provisions of the Covenant of Grace, according to the good pleasure of God; and it will be noticed that he uses the same word "dogmasi," to express Ordinances as he does in his Epistles to the Ephesians. This interpretation is consistent with the whole context which should govern the meaning intended, and alone reconcilable with his other declarations.

His "God forbid"—yea we establish the law is unequivocal, and not to be clouded by inferences.

And chiefly Christ's own declaration "think not I am come to destroy the law and the prophets—I am not come to destroy but to fulfil," is conclusive.

At v. 16, he adds "let no man therefore judge you in meats or in drinks or in respect of a holiday, or of the New Moon or of the Sabbath days."

These being all Jewish were not binding upon the Gentiles—"Sabbatōn" is plural and refers to the Jubilee Sabbaths—and it may be to the perverted National Sabbath. It does not refer to the Decalogue Sabbath. And the Christian Sabbath is only known in Scripture as the 1st day of the week, or the Lord's day.

In his letter to the Corinthians it is evident that he had established, in forming their Church, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath to be kept, from the instructions he sends them about the collection for the saints. 1 Corinthians 16 : 2.

To the Hebrews, 10 : 25, he writes, "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is, &c."

Neither by precept, nor example, can it be shown that he abrogated the Sabbath day; but the very contrary.

Our substitute, under the Covenant of Grace, squared our account with the violated Standard Law, by paying the full penalty for transgression, and by a life blameless by its most exacting demands. No discount was asked for or admitted of from the full value by the abrogation of the Sabbath in the settlement.

By the law of substitution we are delivered from the jurisdiction of the Standard Law. We are transferred to the jurisdiction of our substitute. While He has provided for the transgressions of His follower before union with Him, and for his after daily errors from human frailty, He demands that he follow Him in all earnestness, steadily keeping before him the Standard Law as his example, under His own spiritual interpretation, warning him, "That unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

In the Communion Service of the Church of England the Decalogue is solemnly read, and to each commandment the response by the congregation is, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law." If a clergyman, believing in its abrogation, were to leave out, for consistency sake, the Fourth Commandment, he would shock his congregation, and he would arouse the feelings of the outside world against himself.

The Decalogue from Mount Sinai is our Standard Law.

Is the running of street cars a violation of its Fourth Commandment?

If the Decalogue is binding on all, as it undoubtedly is, the Fourth Commandment, from its position and its influence, demands a more scrupulous interpretation than the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth, which we so jealously protect from infringement through our courts of law.

Again, those of the public who have no scruples in this matter, are not justified in demanding from the Street Car Co., who give a comparatively superior weekly service, a Sunday service, possibly unremunerative, and possibly objectionable to its members on conscientious grounds.

Any Jewish interpretation is rejected by some with scorn. This is unwise. The Jews have been the chief factors in the development of the Covenant.

Though scattered now among the different nations of the earth, the fragmentary portions of this denationalized people, in the face of all diversified political and social conditions, remain a distinct element of every population. Though thus dismembered, they retain in all its purity their Hebrew identity, unprecedented of any other nation in the annals of history. They are undoubtedly an exceptional people as a "Bush on fire and not consumed." When the times of the Gentiles shall have been fulfilled, they shall

recognize Christ as the Messiah of prophecy, and then they shall be gathered and replanted in the land of their ancestor, Abraham, when they will afford crowning evidence to the truth of Christianity, and tend to its propagation more, perhaps, than all the efforts of our missionary societies.

The late Lord Beaconsfield's remarks are worthy of note. He says, " They will accept the whole of their religion, instead of only the half of it, as they grow more familiar with the true history and character of the New Testament. Perhaps, too, in this enlightened age, as his mind expands, and he takes a comprehensive view of this period of progress, the pupil of Moses may ask himself, whether all the princes of the House of David have done so much for the Jews as that Prince who was crucified on Calvary? Had it not been for Him the Jews would have been comparatively unknown, or known only as a high oriental caste, which had lost its country. Has He not made their history the most famous in the world? Has He not hung up their laws in every temple? Has not He vindicated all their wrongs? Has not He avenged the victory of Titus, and conquered the Cæsars? What successes did they anticipate from their Messiah? The wildest dreams of their rabbis have been far exceeded. Has not Jesus conquered Europe, and changed its name to Christendom? All countries that refuse the cross, wither, &c."

When Frederick the Great asked his chaplain for a reason in two words for believing in Christianity, the chaplain replied, "The Jews."

The Bible, by Jewish writers, is the Educator of the world, under the special providence of God.

Though we are in no way bound by their civil or ceremonial typical law, which has served its purpose, we have common interest in the Decalogue, the Standard Law.

The tribe of Levi was appointed specially for the Temple service. But their prophets had a higher commission. They were God's heralds to the world. To them was given the power of interpreting His Law, and of foretelling the future development of the Covenant. Isaiah was one of the chiefs. He was not a civic functionary of the Jews, entrusted with judicial powers. He was a special servant of the great Creator, charged with a commission to the whole human race Gentile as well as Jew—to declare prophetically the counsel of God in carrying out His Covenant to a completion. His authority from God is authenticated by the exact fulfilment of his prophecies. He announces " Give ear, O Earth, for the Lord hath spoken."

He is called upon to declare the Fourth Commandment and mark his instructions, "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet." He proclaims.

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath from doing thy pleasure on my holy day and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shall honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words—then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." Isaiah 58: 1-13.

The Law of God is unchangeable. Its interpretation then is its interpretation now.

But we are permitted to interpret it ourselves. The requirement is "to keep it holy." What is the meaning of "holy?" Its meaning determines our obligation. Holiness, as an attribute of God, was unknown to the world. No language had a word to represent it. The Hebrew word "quadhosh," conveyed the idea of purity by a periphrasis. A victim for sacrifice was required to be a male without spot or blemish—from a class of animals styled "clean." It was killed and washed and required to be offered by a consecrated priest—in the outer court, before the Holy of Holies. This course impressed the Israelite with a very solemn idea of purity, and of the sacredness of the victim devoted by consecration to the service of God with an awful idea of the Holiness of the Being within the veil. This Hebrew word is translated by the Greek word, "agios," which is rendered by the Saxon word "holy," losing its original import "Whole, wholly" and taking the meaning of the Hebrew word through the Greek.

The word, "holy," in the Commandments is thus a very sacred word signifying "consecrated to God," excluding the consideration of any thing human beyond necessity and mercy. No man is entitled to modify it, or to substitute any other word for it.

It specially excludes all works for our own convenience and pleasure. God claims the day as His. The observance is not a matter of option but of duty.

Were a lawyer retained to give a professional opinion, on the line of law, he would say,

"That, on the admitted facts of man's trial under a Covenant of Works, his transgression and condemnation, the Legislator had, in a Covenant of Grace, the sole right of dictating its terms; and that any suggestion on the part of the transgressor would be arrogantly irreverent;

"That, in accord with the unchangeable character of the Legislator, the Covenant of Grace must be construed strictly as reme-

dial, not in any way changing, altering, or abrogating a feature of the Covenant of Works ;

“ That the Legislator chose to carry out the Covenant of Grace through a human agency and under a settled system, in which, under the varied forms which, in its development, circumstances might warrant, its principles, as remedial, should continue unalterable ;

“ That, under a Subsidiary Covenant, He selected Abraham, as representing mankind, for carrying it out, not because of his individual merit, but of His own good pleasure ;

“ That He summoned his natural seed to Mount Sinai in their representative character, as the Supreme Ruler of all, where He first promulgated by voice, amidst solemn surroundings, the Decalogue as the Divine Standard of Morals in Ten Commandments ;

“ That every man individually is bound by laws promulgated to them as representatives of the human race ;

“ That to indicate their universal and perpetual obligation, He wrote them Himself as described, with His own finger on two tables of stone—on one, four regulating our duty to God—and on the second, six, our duty to man ; and He required them to be deposited in the Ark.

“ That the Decalogue is, from its peculiar characteristics, beyond the cognizance of a human tribunal, and can be administered by God alone ;

“ That it was intended to be the initial lesson in inaugurating the Christian branch of the system, as St. Paul wrote to his Gentile converts, the Galatians, declaring it “ to be a school master to bring us to Christ,” by instructing the demoralized world in the Holiness of the Legislator ; in convicting man of his sinfulness—and inability by nature to keep it—and thus leading him to Christ his substitute.

“ That a national law was delivered to His minister, Moses, of a duplex character—the chief element consisting of types and ceremonies foreshadowing Christ, and instructive of His character, His life and death, as our substitute, and terminable on His personal appearance—another of laws for their internal policy, as a nation, obligatory upon themselves alone.

“ That without going into the fulfilment, by the Covenant of Grace, of all the demands of the Covenant of Works, which is out-

side of the present question, it is evidently established that the Decalogue is as binding now on all, as at its promulgation. This is clearly proved by Christ Himself, who, before entering on His mission, declared absolutely "I am not come to destroy the Law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil."

Again, when asked by a lawyer, "Which is the great commandment?" summarizing the two tables, He said,

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

"This is the first and great commandment,—and the second is like unto it,

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Matthew 22: 36.

"On these two Commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Moreover His Apostle Paul indignantly repelled the least insinuation that he made void the Law through his doctrine of Faith, by declaring "God forbid—yea we establish the Law."

"That the Apostles and founders of the Church kept as their Sabbath the first day of the week.

"That the fourth Commandment is impressively enforced. It has peculiar features. The first word, "Remember," strikes us—Its command is unambiguous by one solemn word "Holy." Its details go beyond personal obligation and extend to our responsibility for any man or beast—or any thing under our power.

"That the term 'Holy,' is unequivocal—and that any engagement outside of it is a transgression, which merits condemnation.

"That the interpretation of it by Isaiah, as a *prophet*, is authoritative.

"That Christ's remark "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," referred merely to cases of necessity and mercy, in accord with true Gospel doctrine, "I will have mercy—not sacrifice."

"That running street cars or public conveyances for general purposes or convenience is evidently a violation of its command, meriting condemnation.

"That public games, however healthful and innocent at other times, cannot be considered "holy," and must of course be a breach of the Commandment.

"That such is the inviolability of Law that argument for maintaining a contract contrary to its terms is vain—but is silenced in face of an overt breach, clearly proved by evidence."

Suggestions as "I see no harm in this, or that," may be multiplied by the many to nullify the Sabbath. They are akin to the

traditions of the Elders, which called forth Christ's withering quotation from Isaiah, "In vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Cases of necessity and mercy should be provided for privately, and each case dependent on its own responsibility. The six days are ours—the seventh day is God's. Motives consistent with the requirement must govern. Two men may go on bicycles, as a mere means of locomotion, or two men on their feet; one in either case profitably and properly—the other unprofitably and improperly.

The most specious pretext for cars, is the convenience for Church goers. Some may have preference for greater eloquence. Clergymen may even regret the severance of old members by a change of residence; but the law is, "Remember the Sabbath day 'to keep it holy.'" Besides, it is unpatriotic to the general cause to create jealousies, and to deprive local Churches of their natural support.

After all, the Revelation of "Christ incarnate, and Him crucified," requires not the touches of "excellency of speech," as St. Paul wrote the Corinthians. It shines more resplendent in the purer garb of simple language to the sincere Christian. The true beauties of a picture of real worth are apt to be overlooked by the attractions of a gorgeous frame.

The argument of the humanitarian in the interest of the working man is an error. Besides, it is impractical. He could not afford, out of his small weekly pittance, to pay for pleasure excursions for himself, his wife and children. A half weekly holiday out of the over-worked six days would benefit him more than intermeddling with his statutory holiday, by birthright, for rest and union with his family, whom he has scarcely seen through the week of toil, and for joining with them in the exalting and purifying engagements of a Christian home.

Our diversified conditions afford opportunities for the exercise of the Christian virtues. The more fortunate by birth or prosperity have it in their power to encourage, by friendly advice, kindly intercourse, and in many ways their less fortunate neighbour, earning his bread "with the sweat of his brow." Indeed much of their own comforts they may share without injury to themselves, by opening, for instance, occasionally their garden gates to the deserving.

It is matter of wonder why the Fourth Commandment was ever subjected to a plebiscite. A member of the City Council, objecting, well remarked that he would as soon think of proposing any other.

The truth is, it has peculiar claims. It was instituted at Creation. It was long the only Religion—it is relatively to the others as cause to effect. A due observance of it produces in us a spiritual power for discharging all duties. A general observance ensures a peaceful community, and tends to reduce the enormous expenses of our criminal laws.

It has been subjected to a plebiscite, and it becomes the solemn duty of every man to consider well his obligations before voting, especially as, since writing the foregoing remarks, a judgment of one of our Courts has declared that the game of golf is not an infraction of our law.

Nobody can deny that this and many other games afford innocent pleasure, and are very conducive to health. But the question is are they included in the term “holy”? If not they are a violation of the Fourth Commandment. Our obedience is not a matter of option but of duty. A trivial and regardless answer to the question is unworthy a man of thought.

We are not considering a law of man, but a law of God, and a man should act accordingly, with an advised consciousness of his solemn responsibility. Who can calculate the amount of evil to which his vote, heedlessly given, may contribute in perpetuating a desecration of this Commandment, and for which he will hereafter be accountable? If he shrinks through fear of a future judgment from doing a wrong to his neighbour, how much so should he do so from a wrong to his Judge? In opposition to any suggestion to the contrary, let him remember Christ’s declaration in His Sermon on the Mount, “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least Commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven.”

A gentleman of thought has said “the Church is on its trial,” a position demanding its friends not only to record their own votes in defence, but to use their best endeavours to induce others to do so.

Where are its consecrated guardians?

Is there no modern Isaiah to raise his voice authoritatively, beyond his own immediate charge?

Or shall we ask, is there not a Paul who withstood Peter because he was to be blamed?

Sunday offers pleasures most congenial to a reflecting mind.

Injudicious people, with misguided zeal, may make it very irksome to young people by burdensome tasks and arbitrary restraints.

Pharisaical formalism with the austerities of a morbid temperament are repulsive and antagonistic to the proper observance of the day. Christ denounced them.

"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," was Adam interdicted from joining the Jubilee, by uncongenial and useless restraint? Never—he no doubt rejoiced, as the head of creation, for whose comfort a world so beautiful was provided, and gladly availed himself of the rest days for devout contemplation.

We have a more enlarged knowledge of the works of God. We know that our Earth is only one of a system of other planets, with their respective satellites, extending in space nearly three billions of miles, requiring Omnipotent Wisdom to direct them in their orbits at distances, delicately adjusted, to maintain their mutual relations, and to prevent collisions. Nay we know that the stars are centres of other systems—and the more perfect our telescopes the more we discover, convincing us that Creation is infinite, with numberless worshippers of their Creator.

To produce our day and night requires a revolution of our Globe on its axis of one thousand miles an hour to those on the Equator.

To produce our seasons requires us to travel in our orbit round the sun at the rate of about 68,000 miles an hour.

By such stupendous movements is this habitation for man maintained, pleasing by alternation of sunshine and contemplative night—by the variety of the seasons, each one producing its pleasures—no one more so than the present one, when His frost, that inimitable colorist, is tinging the foliage of our public gardens and private lawns with a gorgeous beauty.

My Father worketh hitherto—said Christ, and I work.

If any one morning the sun were not to rise—or if spring followed not the Winter, what consternation would seize us!

We willingly pay a rent for a dwelling house—should we grudge the seventh part of our time for offering our tribute of gratitude for this world of beauty—providing us with a habitation and food and clothing—and can we forego the privilege of a service which ennobles us by a reactionary influence, to build up a character for Heaven?

Christ scrupulously observed the Sabbath day, not with Phari-saical formalism. He engaged in public and private devotion, and he rejected not the courtesies of social life. He went, we are told, into the house of one of the Pharisees to eat bread on the Sabbath day, when He availed Himself of the opportunity of doing good. Luke 14: 1.

We are not living in the atmosphere of Adam after the fall and before the Promise, one of conscious guilt, fear of condemnation, despondency and hopeless fears of propitiating Divine wrath. We are living in the atmosphere of Adam after the Promise, one of conscious deliverance from condemnation through a Covenant of Grace, high hopes, and the grateful assurance of the love of a reconciled God.

A man may increase knowledge, as a miser his wealth. Neither may derive any personal gratification beyond the pleasure of accumulating. Knowledge must attract and rouse the affections, before its owner can realize its treasures. He requires time for mental digestion. Sunday affords him an undisturbed opportunity. Studying the biography of Christ brings us in touch with Him. As Sir Oliver Mowat, in his "Christianity and some of its Evidences," remarks, "He taught that every doer of the Father's will was (touching assurance) Christ's own brother, and sister and mother." What greater object of possible conception more worthy of our highest aspirations?

All honour to the pioneer Manitoba Government in protecting the sanctity of this Commandment, as regards the street cars.

Toronto has now the proud position of being the pioneer city of the Province of Ontario, in having given her voice for the same end. May she maintain her good name, when the proper time arrives.

So far from being looked down upon as "behind the times," she will earn for herself the more enviable distinction of being an exemplary reformer of the times.

May her decision influence the other cities, and may their united voices be brought to bear upon the Ontario Government to follow the footsteps of its younger sister, the Manitoba Government.

By some it is considered beyond the province of the Government to exceed what might be termed ethical legislation in regulating conduct and education. But is this not a very limited idea of its duty? As our Queen says, the permanent solidity of her empire is dependent upon the Bible. By its authority and principles she has sworn to govern her people. As a Christian community the whole fabric of our Constitution is based upon our recognition of God, as the Sovereign of the universe. From the Governor General downwards to the lowest office of State or police, each official is required before entering on his duties, "to be sworn in" for their faithful discharge. Yea, in a court of law, its procedure, and the rights and claims of parties are established by oath. But a witness who does not recognize God and a future judgment, is inadmissible. Surely, then, it is the interest, as well as the duty of the Legislature to educate the people to a proper sense of their responsibility to God, by maintaining the outward observance at least of His Standard Law, the Decalogue, from open violation, a Standard Law recognized as of Divine authority by all classes of Christians.

While we protect the Second Table in the interests of society by penal laws for transgression, the proper maintaining of the first is essential as the power and authority for their adjudication.

The idea that the march of civilization is tending to disenfranchise man from narrow-minded restraints, is not applicable to the Law of God. It is essential freedom. Its source and end is love.

Our advancing intellects should urge us the more to clear the way for a fuller development of its protective and beneficial influence.

TORONTO, 20th Oct., 1895.

Since writing the above, another judgment of the Court at Hamilton has been given, declaring that running the street cars on Sunday is not an infringement of our civil law. This affects not the question, whether running them is contrary to the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue. It is only to be regretted that the laws of a Christian country are not sufficient to protect from any breach a plain, unambiguous law of God. Every effort should be made to change them.

